

The Religious Inquirer

AND GOSPEL ANCHOR.

Devoted to the Exposition, Defence and Promulgation of the Christian Religion.

'THOU BRINGEST CERTAIN STRANGE THINGS TO OUR EARS—WE WOULD KNOW, THEREFORE, WHAT THESE THINGS MEAN.'

VOLUME XIV.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1835.

NUMBER 24.

THE INQUIRER AND ANCHOR

published simultaneously at Hartford, Conn. and Albany, N. Y. every Saturday at \$2.00 per annum—\$1.50 paid within four months from the time of subscribing.

I. D. WILLIAMSON, } EDITORS AND
R. O. WILLIAMS, } PROPRIETORS.

Brown & Mills, Printers.

services of the following gentlemen are engaged as regular correspondents.

M. H. SMITH, HARTFORD, CT.
J. BOYDEN, DUDLEY, MASS.
C. WOODHOUSE, WEST BRATTLEBORO' VT.

GOOD TIDINGS FROM ELLINGTON.

Original.

A few weeks since, a council of orthodox argymen convened in this place, for the purpose of ordaining a young man, who is to feed us, not together with that bread, which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world, but with a somewhat new, being lately invented, and fermented with a Mr. Taylor's new leaven, instead of John Calvin's, which has become old and stale; besides the heaven is new, from which it is coming. But this bread like most new things, requires some improvement, to make it as precious, as that which cometh down from the heaven; as it is found, from a slight examination, that it will not positively sustain life in any, if at all, but in part; whereas, the old is sure to give life eternal and universal.

Therefore, we cannot but hope, that ere long, the proprietors of this new invention, will so improve it, to make it capable of supporting a needy world, that none may be left, to a hazardous and wretched state, of endless starvation—But to the news.

The above named council, have disclosed a which ought to be universally known, in as much, as it positively proves the unending felicity, every son of Adam. This proof comes from articles of their faith; viz: universal redemption and the final and certain salvation of all the redeemed.

The validity of these articles were strenuously defended for, by those doctors in council; the former, by the Taylorites, and the latter by the Unitarians; and we heartily agree with them, in the truth of both—Thus we find, that modern orthodoxy, is Universalism; at any rate, nothing of this, can possibly result from those two of their creed—Is not this good tidings, which shall be to all people? We think so.

But there may be a question arise in the minds of some, whether these positions are both correct, and for the consideration of those, we

would respectfully submit our reasons, why we think they are.

We presume, it will be admitted, that the creature cannot save itself, or be saved at all without redemption; if so, one point is settled, and the work, if ever done, must be performed by some other being. And we think, that this being must ransom all, if any, to avoid a charge of ungrateful partiality.

Another reason why we think the doctrine of universal redemption is true, is because, the word of God, has declared it to be so. Has not Christ tasted death for every man? Is he not the propitiation for the sins of the whole world? Has he not given himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time? and was not God in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses? If so, the first position is established. On the other hand, will not all who are ransomed be saved? Let the prophet answer.

'The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, and obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.'

If this & other similar testimony to this point, is not sufficiently convincing to all, we will for a moment resort to a simile, if possible, to make it more so, by comparing the partial creeds of men, with the recorded word and attributes of God.—We will suppose, that a numerous family of children are all in a wretched state of bondage, and wholly unable ever to extricate themselves therefrom and that their father unrequested, should send to them a certain number of faithful messengers, with special orders to inform them, that he had been at infinite expense to procure a ransom for all and each of them, to be testified in due time—that he was induced to make this sacrifice, because he so loved them, and so much desired their happiness and freedom—that he had always proposed their salvation, and this purpose, was agreeable to his good will and pleasure. And for their further consolation, they are to be assured that, his purpose, love, good will and pleasure, are changeless, his resources immense, his power omnipotent, and his wisdom and knowledge unbounded, so that it would be infinitely impossible for anything in heaven, earth, or hell, to defeat, or in the least derange his purpose, will, or pleasure. Now kind reader, let us keep these pleasing and heaven born expressions in view, while we turn to the last supposed, final drama, and compare them with the horrid contrast. Here then, are the children presented before their father and while waiting to grasp the glorious reality anticipated, full of exultation and hope of immortal

freedom, they are struck speechless, and their senses paralyzed, as with a shock from seven thunders by the frown of an angry parent and instantly hurled from his presence under the echo of an awful sentence, that would make demons weep to hear, down, down the haggard windings of a fiery gulf, where no gleam of hope can ever come, or friendly angel give relief, there to writhe and groan and welter in the agonies of immortal death and never die. Great God, thou art not that parent and may heaven forbid, that any of thy children should blaspheme thy character, by connecting it with similar transactions! Had we the tongue of an angel, with all the wisdom of all the gods, we could not come so near, as a shadow is to its substance, in portraying the conduct of any being, so malignant and savage, as the father above represented.

Language fails us, yea, and our very soul fails and shrinks back with horror, to give the smallest expression of a tragedy, so replete with infinite cruelty and deception.

But to the simile—suppose these wretched children, were to interrogate their father, how could he exonerate himself from the most wanton barbarity? Should they ask him, if he did not, from the beginning, know the end of all things?

The answer must be, yes.

'Why then, did you, with the knowledge of our endless and inexpressible sufferings, give us formation and sensations, to endure it?'

No answer.

'But we would ask, if it was not your unchangeable will and pleasure, that we should be saved from this place of torment?'

Yes.

'Surely then, our damnation must forever be very unpleasant to your feelings and contrary to your good will.'

No reply.

'Were we rightly informed, when told, that your power, was more than sufficient to subdue all things, and bring them into subjection to your will and pleasure?'

Yes.

'Why then, do you not employ that power, for your own gratification, and our felicity, and not suffer our misery, and your disappointed will and pleasure, to remain to all eternity?'

No answer.

'We would respectfully ask, if you ever performed any act, without intending, that a specific object, should be accomplished by it?'

No.

'Then with our present state in view, what particular object could you have, in the act of our redemption?'

No response.

'And in relation to your unchangeable love for us, we should like to know, if it is the same now, because if it is not, you are mutable, but if it has undergone no change, it must be in unison with our damnation, and a change of it, of course, would produce one in us, infinitely for the better. But we proceed to inquire, if it was not your purpose or intention, that we, among all things, should be gathered together in Christ?'

Yes, be sure, this was my purpose.

But it is impossible for this to be true, for how could you purpose to bring about a thing, which you plainly foresaw, would never take place?—Therefore your purpose must be thwarted, instead of being accomplished, unless, our being gathered together in hell, is what you meant, by being alive in Christ.

But the father perceiving that his inquisitive children, were about to charge him justly with the cause of their misery, at last resorted to a stratagem, to exonerate himself, and transfer the cause to them, by secreting the monster, infinite cruelty, behind the fog of free-agency.

A slight investigation, however, by way of inquiry, soon expelled the mist, and exposed the deception.

Now father, in relation to this free-agency, we would ask. Did you know, when you bestowed it upon us, that we should so improve it, as to bring us to this place of despair?

Yes, I know all about it.

'Then, it is impossible, you could have any other object, except the one you knew of. Therefore it must be irresistibly true, that if our eternal misery, has in any way, come to us, through the medium of this agency, the act of giving it to us is the first cause of our misery; and this, with all other things, which have resulted, or ever will result from this act, are the only known effects of the great first cause.'

No answer to the point.

'And you might as well, in the first place, have given us our existence in hell, as to have connected it with an agency, which you know, would be sure, to land us there; and what else, but a mere pretext, to shift the cause on us, can be assigned, for taking the latter course? The same would be true, had you designed us for everlasting bliss, and given us heaven for our birth place; our happiness in this case, could not have been, in your mind, any more certain, than if you had placed us in a state of probation, for a short space, to work a particular machine, that would produce the same result. And the principal difference it could make with us in either way, would be in the evil effects of the latter, which would directly tend to shift the merits of the Saviour to the saved and make us pharisees and hypocrites.'

We have done with our simile, and shall have the reader to draw his own inferences from its allusions; although we ought to remark, that the palpable contradictions, the vile deception, and egregious inconsistencies found in it justly and unavoidably represents the Limitarian's God, and not the only living and true God, who has declared himself to be 'the Saviour of all men, especially them that believe' this declaration. This is in very deed, the Universalist's God, against whom, none of those glaring absurdities, noticed in the simile, can be brought; because, all the manifest-

ations of universal reconciliation, revealed to us by this Parent, are in perfect unison with his attributes and character. And we are confident, that whenever this character, shall be rightly appreciated and understood, all the black catalogue of fire and brimstone, ghosts and demons, with all the concomitant ingredients of human invention, to produce a perpetuate infinite cruelty, will vanish, like a midnight vision.

But to return—we will barely observe, that of all the schemes to get folks to heaven, or hell, this free-agent system, appears to us, the most sophistical, as well as the most difficult to reconcile with the word and attributes of God. Suppose we look into this word and ask the apostle a few questions in relation to this co-partnership business.

'Paul, how are we to obtain justification of life? By a free gift.'

'But, cannot we receive it, by the exercise of our agency?'

No, for 'all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.'

But, will not good works give us some claim to it.

No, for, 'if it be work, it is no more of grace. I say, 'it is the gift of God, not of works, least any man should boast.' And moreover, this gift is without partiality, for 'by the righteousness of one, the free gift, came upon all men unto justification of life.'

God has declared in his word, that the salvation of all men, was agreeable to his will and purpose, this being the truth, he accordingly calls upon all men every where, to repent and turn from their unbelief, and come to the knowledge of the truth.

But how can free-agency be reconciled with these declarations, coming from a being of infinite knowledge? Would it not be positively false, for any being to say, that it was his will and purpose, to save some other one, whom he knew would be forever lost, no matter from what cause, whether from his agency, decree, or any thing else? And how could a God, who is infinitely wise and good, with any degree of propriety, consistent with truth, purpose, or intend will, or wish the salvation of any creature; and at the same time give it an agency, or any other thing, which he perfectly foresaw, would be the means of its eternal damnation?

But we forbear; the subject is already protracted beyond the limits intended. We only have to say, that we rejoice with our modern orthodox brethren, in the truth of two important items of their faith—universal redemption and the sure salvation of all the redeemed.

Let these facts be rightly appreciated and universally disseminated, and the angel's proclamation of 'good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people,' will be verified; and all the partial stumbling blocks in the way of universal holiness and happiness, will vanish to the four winds of heaven.

E. S.

APPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE.

Original.

'Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar,

and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.'

Br. G. S. of Cortlandville, N. Y. has favored the public with a few comments on the above passage of scripture, in the Magazine and Advocate of the 15th inst, from which I have selected the following pertinent remarks, which are worthy the notice of every Universalist. 'The minister of the gospel, who falls short of his duty, in the particulars set forth in the text, is in our estimation, doing an incalculable injury to the advancement of the work of reconciliation. He prevents its taking place in every instance wherever he refuses, 'first to be reconciled to his brother.' With every brother, therefore, when he has ought against his brother, instead of setting it down in malice, first communicate the cause of his complaint, not to the world, nor to any one except the brother offending?' Right, my brother! and the requirements are just and reasonable; for in too much truth, we can lament, with our church brethren, that 'we have left undone those things we ought to have done; & have done those things which we ought not to have done.' The experience of every day convinces us that to 'err is to be man.' Absolute perfection is not an attribute of man in this state of existence; and thus saith the apostle, 'in many things we offend all' (or all offend.) However, we may not all be guilty alike, some are in fault with respect to some particular thing—and others are so respecting other things. A far greater number of faults or improprieties are combined in some characters, than others; and while faults of a criminal nature exist, some, there are those of a different kind to which we are all addicted in a greater or less degree; faults, which perhaps may not, and indeed cannot, affect the moral character, as they do the manners, and, were if they are considered innocent themselves, wherever allowed, tend to exert an unfavorable influence over the minds of others, the formation of their opinions respecting us, and in this view they are a great obstacle in the way of our accomplishing that amount of good we are anxious to bring about. But we have capacity for improvement, without regard to our moral character, our general deportment, and manner; consequently an amendment of our faults may be effected, and this is truly desirable.

It is a duty we owe to ourselves, to render each other assistance, in the grand work of amending and reconciliation, to exercise a watchfulness over each other, as Christians, especially, as we are aware that our own faults will occasionally elude our perception in spite of all our exertions to prevent them. As there exist many errors in practice, and inadvertencies in manner, which arise partly from inattention, or are the result of habits, that have gained the ascendancy, by perceptible advances, and exist too, without being hardly perceived by the individual himself—should be cautious in our advances towards amendment. Great care should be taken, we do not confound those errors in practice, inadvertencies, which are trifling, with those a large wrongs which proceed from wicked intentions—and thereby defeat the object we have in view. It is very important that, in our attempts to aid the reformation of another, we proceed in a proper manner—we should not feel to reprove a brother for his errors, nor assume airs that

far from becoming fallible men; but manifest a meek and humble spirit, such as aims at the good of the individual; for rest assured, if we depart from the law of kindness and humility, and act upon a different principle, when endeavoring to correct the faults of another; it will be observed by him, and its influence serve to defeat what we are professedly undertaking to perform. Then when we would correct the fault of another, we should not cry aloud! 'hear, O, Israel,'—we should not raise our voices like a trumpet, and show the world our brother's transgressions—and in this way cause him to suffer in the opinion of the world, and particularly, in the estimation of those who should act as brethren towards him. His fault may be one that has come upon him so imperceptibly, that he is not aware of allowing it; notwithstanding it may be apparent to those around him, he may be ignorant of it himself. Let then his fault be made known to him, admonish him in the spirit of meekness, and christian friendship.

It is not impossible that the mere mention of the fault to him will correct it—but if this fails, reprove with mildness—and his regard for his reputation, the esteem of his brethren and friends—will be powerful motives to induce him to hear you candidly—and as you are thus aiding him in correcting his faults, he will consider you as his friend indeed.

It is very necessary in such cases, that we take heed to ourselves, lest in reproofing him, we be overtaken in fault, and allow that in ourselves, which we condemn in our brother. By proceeding in this manner, we shall not prejudice the minds of a community (ready to credit and will report and condemn) against him who is suspected of having erred—or him who is unfortunately found in fault; nor raise suspicions respecting the character of a brother which are cruel and unjust. And instead of destroying the usefulness of one who we may have supposed has erred, we may be instrumental in reclaiming him whose faults are perceivable, and restoring him to the path of righteousness and peace.

Let us each, be diligent in the improvement of our individual characters, and general deportment—be kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even, as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us. Let us not disregard any obligation to do good, neglect not, the performance of the duties enjoined us, by the beloved apostle, in the following words—'Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye, which are spirited, restore such an one, in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.'

Finally brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things; be actuated by the spirit of that heavenly doctrine, which breathes peace on earth, good will to man; and the God of love be with you.

Aug. 1835.

A. C.

Original.

To Rev. Mr. Dorchester of Norwich, Ct. a Methodist Presiding Elder.

DEAR SIR:—I was one of your hearers at the recent quarterly meeting in Hadlyme; and, dis-

cussing from 1 Timothy 4, 8. But godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come, you told us that godliness meant every thing taught in the word of God. Now sir, you are aware that the word of God teaches us to love our enemies, bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate, despitefully use, and persecute us—to render not evil for evil, but good for evil—that we may be the children of our Father in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and unjust. But how different is this from teaching that God will cast off the wicked to all eternity! Would it be profitable for a parent to place a disobedient child in such a situation that he would be compelled to disobey as long as he lived? Would eternal disobedience be a satisfactory penalty for temporary disobedience? What saith the scripture? 'The Lord will not cast off forever; but, though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies.' He chastens us for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Suppose a parent were to put his children on probation for one week; he informs them that those who obey his commands shall be happy during the remainder of their lives; and those who disobey shall be miserable the remainder of theirs. At the week's end, the parent calls his children together; a part have disobeyed; the parent delivers them into the hands of one who has always been a bitter enemy to himself and children; and has deceived them, and been the cause of their disobedience. His grand object has been to torment these children, and his object is gained. The parent as a penalty delivers them up to be tortured in his presence as long as they live. Would this be profitable? If not, is it godliness.

I have one statement of yours to notice which claims some attention. You told us there was a man in Norwich one of the pillars of the Universalist society in that place, who was taken sick a few days ago and died—that while he was sick, his daughter, who was a christian, called in one of your brethren to talk and pray with him. And the man thought he was an angel sent from God. He saved his soul from hell and sent it to heaven! Here, in your view, godliness was profitable. This, sir, I think was your language nearly verbatim. Now sir to be candid with you, I doubt the occurrence of any such thing in Norwich, notwithstanding your profession of holiness; for I have seen too many men of like profession to credit all they say.

But suppose your statement correct, what does it prove? That Universal salvation is false? No; it proves that a man whose body and mind were diseased was deceived by one of your brethren. Now I cannot discover, either godliness, or profitability in the man's conversion. But what was he converted from? Why, a belief in the impartial grace of God,—that Jesus shall finish transgression, make an end of sin, destroy the devil and his works, and bring in everlasting righteousness; and converted to the doctrine of endless sin and suffering—from the belief that God would save him and his neighbors, to the belief that God will save him and roast his neighbors in hell to all eternity. Happy conversion! If you wish to con-

vince Universalist that endless misery is a Bible, and reasonable doctrine, you must not expect to do it by telling them that a sick man thought your brother was an angel sent from God; for they are too well acquainted with such brethren to believe any such thing. And I assure you that the converts to the Methodist doctrine in this place are no better than other people. All the theft that has been committed lately in and about this place, according to the best of my information, has been committed by converts to Methodism. On the 1st of August, two escaped from gaol in Haddam, confined there on charge of Burglary.

No these are not the only cases that can be named; and so long as men teach that people may commit all manner of crime and avoid punishment by repentance, we may expect to witness the practice of iniquity. But teach them that 'he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong he hath done'—that God 'will by no means clear the guilty'—that the only way to avoid punishment is to avoid crime—and every one that believes it will abandon his wickedness. Let us remember that 'the way of the transgressor is hard,' that wisdom's ways, are of pleasantness and all her paths are peace. Respectfully yours

SAMUEL DANIELS.

Hamburgh, Aug. 1835.

ATHEISM—DEISM—UNIVERSALISM.

Reader—here are three *isms*—and the question we wish you to consider is this—Do they convey to the mind of any intelligent man, the same sentiment, or even a similar one? In reading the periodicals of the present day, we not unfrequently find them used in such connection, and under such circumstances, as would lead a careless observer to conclude, that they are synonymous expressions, and teach precisely the same doctrine. But is this true? Let us see.

First—What is Atheism? Atheism is as lexicographers tell us, 'the doctrine which teaches the non-existence of God.' This may not, to be sure, express all the points of doctrine, which an atheist may inculcate—for he may inculcate, with this erroneous sentiment may excellent, moral and philosophical doctrines—but this, we suppose, gives him the distinguishing appellation of an atheist. Let him believe what else he may, or inculcate any other doctrine he may choose—if he denies the existence of God, he is in the proper sense of the expression, an atheist; and the doctrine he inculcates, in this particular, is atheism. So, at least, we understand the expression, and so we state it.

Second—What is Deism? Deism, as we understand it stands, in relation to the existence of God, in direct opposition to atheism. It is, in fact, a doctrine which finds in God the cause of all things. But this term is used also, to express a disbelief in revelation. To be sure, this sentiment is not inseparable from the term, in its strict and proper sense; but it seems to be included in it, nevertheless, by the common consent of all writers upon the subject. This being the case, we may conclude deism to be this—a belief in the existence of God, but a denial of the doctrines of revelation.

Third—What is Universalism? Universalism in the relation to the existence of God, does not differ from deism. It holds, with that doctrine, that God is the cause of all things. But in relation to the doctrine of revelation it differs ex-

ceedingly. It teaches us that God has made a special revelation of his will to man; and has clearly made known, in his word, the final destiny of his intelligent family. It regards Christ as the appointed and commissioned Saviour of the world, and teaches the ultimate salvation of all men, through his ministry and mediation.—And finally, it gives its believers an encouraging assurance of future life and immortality beyond the grave.

And now we ask the intelligent reader, sincerely and candidly—Do you not perceive a manifest difference between these doctrines?—Can you say in truth and soberness, that Universalism is either deism or atheism? Or can you say that deism is atheism, or atheism is deism, or that either of them is Universalism?—Ponder well these questions and let the answer be given according to the prompt dictates of an enlightened conscience. We fear not the result. No honest man, who can claim a discerning mind, will ever rest satisfied with any other than the true and proper answer. Every one must say—there is a difference, a vast difference.—*Gospel Banner.*

THE DAY OF THE LORD.

We are aware that most christians generally attach to the phrases, 'the day of the Lord, great and notable day, terrible day, day of wrath,' &c. the idea that they refer to what is termed, 'the day of general judgment,' when this earth is to be whelmed in the devouring flames of the final conflagration, when the sun is to withdraw its shining, when the moon is to be turned into blood, and the congregated millions of Adam's race are to hear their final and irrevocable doom.

Nothing to us seems farther from the truth than such an exposition, and when Universalists have put a different construction on the above passages and their connexion, they have been charged with 'handling the word of God deceitfully and perverting its true meaning.'

But let the candid reader attend to the testimony of such authorities as the learned and judicious Horne and Calmet, who were not Universalists, and then decide whether we are so much in the habit of 'wresting the scriptures.' We read Joel ii, 1, 3, 'Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain—let all the inhabitants of the land tremble; for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. A day of darkness and gloominess,' &c. and ver. 10, 'The earth shall quake before them, the heavens shall tremble; the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining, for the day of the Lord is very great and very terrible; and who can abide it?'

Bishop Horne in his 'Introduction to the critical study and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures,' says, 'frequently the country (meaning Palestine) was laid waste by vast bodies of migrating Locusts, whose depredations are one of the most terrible scourges with which mankind can be afflicted. By the prophet Joel (says he) they are termed the army of the Lord. They fly in countless hosts, occupying a space of two or three miles in length by a mile, or a mile and a half in breadth so as to obscure the sun, and bring a temporary darkness upon the land.'

Here the learned Bishop understands the prophet to allude to the time when the devouring locusts spread over the land, consuming ev-

ery green thing in their way and laying waste the products of the earth as though a raging fire had burned there; this the prophet calls, the 'day of the Lord,' then was 'the sun darkened,' &c.

Calmet, (whose authority will not be called in question by the learned world,) says in his 'Dictionary of the Holy Bible,' that 'the expressions I will cover the heavens with darkness, 'the sun' shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood,' &c. signify very great calamities, personal and national.' The meaning of the passage, Joel ii, 31, 'the moon shall be changed into blood,' he says is this: 'the moon shall appear red like blood, as it does in some degree during an eclipse.'

From the foregoing facts we learn that the phrase 'day of the Lord' was not used by the prophets to signify the destruction of this material world, but to denote calamities of a temporal nature to which the country was subject, and which were sometimes brought on as the special judgments of an All-wise and over-ruling Providence.

When we take into consideration the fact that 'the Holy Land' was the scene of such a direful scourge as the countless swarms of locusts; that there the tremendous volcano vomited forth its molten fire, and the fearful earthquake tore asunder the mountains, and made the perpetual hills 'to bow,' we can rationally and truly account for the appalling imagery with which the scripture writers have clothed their language. To contend that they were alluding to the overwhelming displays of a judgment day in eternity, is to 'darken counsel by words without knowledge.'

The incident is very fresh in our memory that some six or seven years ago, while conversing with a lady, a member of the Presbyterian church, we dared (indeed it was almost impious) to express the opinion that there was no such place as an endless hell. The good lady, seemingly conscious of the torpedo-power of the weapon which she was about to wield, suiting her countenance, and manner, and voice to the occasion, with a look that would have graced the man who once set out for Damascus, exclaimed, 'Ah, we shall all know at the great day!' I mention this to show the prevailing notion that exists among christians to refer such phrases, 'day of the Lord,' and 'the great day,' to the future state, when nothing is plainer than scriptures, whether these are so.—*Messenger and Universalist.*

INFIDEL TESTIMONY.

When we use the word *infidel*, we intend nothing disrespectful, any more than we do when we use the word *orthodox*. They are both words, which by long usage, and by general consent have taken to themselves a meaning which in many respects is most palpably absurd. Indeed the utmost meaning we can now attach with certainty to these words, being governed by the sense in which they are generally employed, would bear but a very distant relation to their true and original definition. No words are used more improperly, or in a more vague and indefinite manner. For example; the Universalists are frequently called infidels by those people who call themselves orthodox. But it does not necessarily follow that we are according to the true meaning of the term infidel, or that our accusers are in fact orthodox. The only undisputed fact in this case, is, that a difference

of sentiment does exist, but who has the most of truth can never be known by popular or reproachful titles. When therefore, we have occasion to use our neighbor's name, we will endeavor to pronounce it as he himself does, and not as his enemies would speak it. The witnesses then, which we intend to introduce in this article are such persons as were professed unbelievers in christianity, and of course infidels in relation to that doctrine. We are not about to inquire, if these things are so, if such a being as Christ was never upon earth, what shall we say to the testimony of the famous historian and compiler of Jewish antiquities, Josephus? Hear ye him. 'Now there was about that time Jesus, a wise man if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and Gentiles; He was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them the third day alive again.' What but the power of truth could compel a Jewish High Priest to admit so much concerning the founder of a religious system that was calculated to overthrow his own priesthood. It is evident that Josephus was not a friend to Christianity—he was an infidel and an enemy to the system. Yet his testimony is to the point, and our conclusion are, therefore, irresistible. More might be taken from the same author, but the reader is referred to the 3d chapter, 18th book of the Jewish antiquities where his full testimony is recorded. The writings of Porphyry, Celsus, Julian and other early opposers of Christianity might be here noticed with propriety, but the testimony of later writers is so full we need not stop too long at a distance. Mr. Chubb, a professed infidel has said, 'that there was probably such a person as Jesus Christ and that his ministry seems in general to have terminated in the public good; that it is also probably that he would not impose upon and lead mankind astray to their hurt.' (Chubb's Posthumous works Vol. 2d. page 41—43—394—396.) Mr. Hobbs who was equally inimical to the system of Christ, has allowed that 'his writings manifest no intention in their author to make his system subservient to the purposes of civil Sovereignty?' (Leviathan page 303—4.) Lord Bolingbroke further grants that 'the doctrines of Christ are recorded in the words in which he taught them.' (See his works, Vol. 4 p. 390.) Undoubtedly the evidences in proof of this most perfect system were so conspicuous to the minds of the authors above named, that to avoid an uneasy conscience they rather chose to bear witness to the truth, although infidelity should by that means suffer loss.—Other witnesses might be heard no less conclusive upon this point, but enough has already been said to show that Christ was the founder of Christianity, even our enemies being judges. That he lived during the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, and was crucified by the Jews under their procurator Pontius Pilate, is no more doubtful than that Tiberius was ever Emperor of Rome, or Pilate a Viceroy of Judea, relying on infidel testimony to substantiate the fact.

Watchman.

There is no true glory, no true greatness, without virtue; without which we do but abuse all the good things we have, whether they be great

or little, false or real. Riches make us either covetous or prodigal; fine palaces make us despise the poor and poverty; a great number of domestics flatter human pride, which uses them like slaves; valor oftentimes turns brutal and unjust; and a high pedigree makes a man take up with the virtues of his ancestors, without endeavoring to acquire any himself. *M. Scudery*

INQUIRER AND ANCHOR.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1835.

To Rev. W. B. SPRAGUE, D. D. No. 1.—*Dear Sir*,—For something more than five years past I have resided in this city, as a public advocate of the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness. I have constantly taught in 'the synagogues' and testified 'both to small and great, that Jesus is the Christ, the Savior of the world.' Yet so high and impassable are the barriers of sectarian prejudice, that I remain unto this day, a stranger to most of the clergy of the city; for it may now be said, as in the days of the Savior, 'the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.' To your person I am a stranger; but with your character, and writings, I am somewhat acquainted, and a few words will explain my object in this communication, and those that may follow.

Universalists as a denomination think they have reason to complain of a lack of candor on the part of those who oppose them. While their doctrines are condemned, with some degree of bitterness as dangerous and false, and themselves denied the christian name, it is not often that they are met in the open field of fair and manly discussion, where they can 'speak for themselves, touching all things whereof they are accused. I have painfully felt the truth of this remark, in its application to the latitude and longitude of this city. The doctrine of which I am an advocate, is counted worthy to receive a respectable share of attention from the clergy of our city. It is by no means a circumstance of unfrequent occurrence, to hear the people warned against it, and affectionately cautioned to beware of being seduced by its charms, or deceived by its arguments. And yet where is the man, who has had the candor or boldness to come out, and in manly controversy canvass these arguments, or confront its advocates? Let me tell you, Dear Sir, that I have always, been willing, nay anxious, to bring this matter before the public, and submit those arguments which I deem conclusive, to the ordeal of a candid investigation, where truth rather than victory shall be the object. To effect this object I have ever labored by every means that I deemed consistent with the gospel. I have more than once called on the clergy, and appealed to them by all those considerations, which I thought ought to bear upon the subject, to take hold of this matter in earnest, and show to me and the world, that the faith in which we rejoice, is not according to the truth, if such indeed be the fact. But I have hitherto called in vain. The twenty watchman, of the city, who are to me, 'of the contrary part' have been silent; not one of them to my knowledge, having alluded to the subject save in a place, or at a time when no reply could be heard. I have at present, no disposition to inquire why these things are so? Whether this seeming reluctance to meet the subject openly and fairly, originates in a conviction, that Universalists, are not worthy of no-

tice, or in some better reason, it is not my province to determine. One thing I do know. 'I have called and they have not heard,' and in the language of the prophet I can say in truth, 'I beheld, and there was no man, even among them, and there was no counsellor, that, when I asked them, could [or would] answer a word.' Isa. xli. 29. I have heard that Dr. Sprague sometimes, deems it proper, to raise an argument against the doctrine of a *world's* salvation, and with some boldness and freedom, to comment upon, the arguments adduced in favor of that much despised gospel. With this I am well pleased, for if you consider the doctrine false, you should oppose it with all earnestness. I now ask you Sir to be as frank with me, as you are with your people, when you stand in the desk. I appeal to you Sir, and I ask you in the spirit of candor, to engage with me in the calm and dispassionate discussion, of the momentous question at issue between us. If I am deceived, I ask you Sir, to undeceive me.

There are several circumstances which encourage me, to make this appeal to you, personally, and which, without flattery, I will mention.

I have not lived here so long without learning, that Dr. Sprague, is a 'man of war from his youth up.' I use not the quotation in a *bad* sense, but to denote the boldness and praise worthy independence with which, regardless of consequences, he maintains and defends, what he believes to be the cause of truth and of God. All that I know of your character as a divine induces me to believe, that Dr. Sprague, is the last man to retreat from a controversy, in which the important or vital principles of his faith are assailed. When the Presbyterians of the 'New School' were coming in like a flood, and threatening to make your church a scene of 'misrule and confusion,' and many were fearful; I remember, and I name it to your credit Sir, that you boldly 'withstood them to the face.'

When enthusiasts or fanatics, had seized upon the livery of a cause, which is of itself a passport to the affections of the people, and in this guise were aiming a blow at one of the institutions of the gospel; and at a time when the more timorous *dare* not speak, you Sir, stood in the gap, and at the hazard of being branded as an advocate of intemperance; raised a warning voice against this unhallowed invasion of the rites of the gospel. These things I have seen, and I have admired the lofty and energetic spirit of independence that they breathe; and it is this knowledge of your character which gives me confidence, that you will not shrink from a discussion of the important question which I shall propose. *Do the holy scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery, or of universal salvation?* This is the question to which I am desirous of inviting your attention, and in the discussion of which I would have you engage, not for victory, but for the truth's sake.

Your judgment will at once decide that it is a question of no ordinary moment. It asks you, and it asks me directly whether myriads on myriads of our brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh, will dwell in pain unmitigated and unrelieved through the long lapse of ceaseless eternity? And sure I am that no question can be of deeper interest to the feeling heart. It is my lot to believe that the whole intelligent universe of God's moral creatures, shall be purified from all sin, and brought to bow in holiness and joy before the throne of the great I AM. I ask you Sir, if there is not an interest thrown around the

question, of the truth or falsity of one or the other of these doctrines, which far transcends all earthly subjects? To me Sir, I am willing to say, that the question of 'new measures or old,' of 'temperance, and ultra temperance,' though they may be important, are nevertheless, lighter in the comparison than the 'gossamers wing.' Taking even your own view of the subject, I can see it in no other light. Allowing that the 'new measures,' are ruinous, endlessly ruinous to souls, and still the subject is small in the comparison. The number that could possibly, under the worst circumstances be ruined, by 'new measures' would be but small, compared, with the 'endless crowds of sinners,' that will be lost, on the supposition that endless misery is true. If you therefore feel interested in a question which involves the salvation or damnation of the *few*, ought you not to feel more, yea much more interest in a question which involves the immortal weal or wo of a large portion of all the multitudes that have lived from Adam to this time, and that shall live from this to the end of the world? I cannot bring myself to believe that Dr. S, who was zealous in the one case, will be indifferent in the other. I have appealed to others less bold in controversy, and I now appeal to you Sir, with a hope that I shall find you, on this subject, as on others, ready to 'contend earnestly for the faith.'

There is another consideration which has had no little weight in determining me to make these proposals. I remember that I address a man whose high standing in society will ensure attention to whatever he may communicate on the subject; and whose talents, as a theologian and writer will throw as much light upon the subject as I could reasonably expect from any quarter. Believe me Sir, I am anxious to possess myself of the best arguments in favor of the doctrine of endless misery, and the most cogent objections that can be urged against that faith in which I rejoice. If there are good and substantial reasons why the one should be believed and the other rejected, I desire, and the denomination to which I am attached, also desire to know what they are. Knowing that you are able to bring a well disciplined mind to the work, and do as much in behalf of the more common doctrine as any man with whom I am acquainted, I have thought proper to ask your attention to the subject. If the doctrine of universal salvation is unscriptural or untrue, you will doubtless be able to prove it, and you will permit me to assure you Sir, that whatever you may write upon the subject will be read by none with more avidity than the Universalist public. Should you feel disposed to notice this letter, you will distinctly understand that the columns of this paper are at your service, for any reply that you may wish to make, as also for any other articles you may send us upon the subject to which I have taken the liberty to direct your attention. Let there be no flourish of swords, or 'striving for mastery,' but with cool deliberation and christian candor let us come to the investigation, praying that the spirit of wisdom may guide us, and on which side soever the truth may be, we may be confident it will not be the loser. Truth will come forth like gold from the furnace, and endure forever. I will add further that whatever may be your decision, in relation to the propriety or utility of entering into an examination of this subject, my present purpose is to pursue it, and from time to time to lay before you the 'reasons for the hope that it is in me,' and I shall not cease to desire that you will favor them with an at-

tentive consideration, and the public with such notices or comments as you may think proper. With the best wishes for your health, prosperity and usefulness I am Dear Sir

Yours in the Gospel,

I. D. WILLIAMSON.

THE SCORNER.—The common sense and observation of most men will discover much truth in the 'proverb' of the wise man, that 'a scorner seeketh wisdom and findeth it not.' To disdain receiving instruction from those whom we consider our inferiors in point of talent, learning, wealth or respectability, is a sure mark of an unwise man. The requirement of Philip, when inquired of, 'can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?' was, 'come and see.' And had Nathaniel scorned and condemned the Son of man in consequence of the meanness of his extraction, he could not have gained the wisdom of heaven which he received. He might have sought it in some other way, but he would not have found it. None are so mean and so ignorant, but the most learned and respectable may gain some information from them. And none are so foolish but the most wise may increase their wisdom, by condescending to hold occasional intercourse with them. He therefore who scorns such as he considers weak and foolish, mean and ignorant, may seek wisdom, but will not always find it. This is particularly true in reference to many, over wise, scornful, bigoted, and self-conceited believers in endless misery. They say 'they know not what Universalism is, and they do not wish to know'—or 'they know it is a bad doctrine, and its advocates are loose and licentious, and that is all they want to know about it.' Some enemy of the doctrine has told them that this is the case, and they are very ready to credit his slanders. And yet they are constantly seeking for arguments to refute it, and means to prevent its prevalence; but they almost always fail. They are wise enough in all conscience in their own conceits; they have a sufficiency of the wisdom of 'this world, but in that which is from above they are lacking. It is true of them, and we would, that they were wise enough to see it, that 'the scorner seeketh wisdom and findeth it not.'

We do not say this of every believer in endless misery; but only such as refuse to be informed what Universalism is. There are many who have taken pains to ascertain what the doctrine is; and they have found, too, that it is not so bad as it has been represented by its enemies. Consequently their feelings towards it are different, more favorable; and they have more charity, more christianity about them than those who refuse to hear the instructions of wisdom. What can a man think to condemn a doctrine, and at the same time refuse to know what it is? It is like a court of justice which would refuse to hear a man's defence, but hang him without ceremony, and afterwards grant him a trial. We hope that scornors of this kind are very scarce in the world, though we have some reason to believe they are numerous. We entreat them to become more meek and humble, and we assure them that, in this way, they will acquire a greater degree of true wisdom.

R. O. W.

THE EXPOSE AGAIN.—Our readers may remember that we noticed, a short time since, a tract headed "an expose of Universalism," said to have been written by a certain Lutheran Clergyman in Brunswick N. Y. We have not much more to say about the thing, but we took it up again the other day and our eye fell upon a curious question which we deem worthy of a passing remark, on account of its novelty. We have despaired of ever finding a new argument against Universalism, but the tract contains one that is new to us, and we therefore record it that it may be preserved. On the 14th page of the said tract the reader may find this serious question,—

Hear it, ye who dare to be Universalists! and see if the mark of the beast is not upon you:

'When and where have we ever heard Universalists complain of fatigue from great labor in doing good?'

So then no man can be a true christian unless he frequently complains of fatigue from great labor in doing good. We recollect of reading of one in olden times who complained of fatigue, and so earnestly was his mind dwelling upon his great labors, that he could not keep the subject out of his prayers. So when he went up into the temple to pray, he stood and prayed thus with himself, 'God I thank thee that I am not as other men, I fast twice in a week and pay tythes of all I possess &c.' Wonder if he want very much fatigued with his 'great labors?'

Again; there were some named in one of the parables of our Lord whose case is worthy of notice. They 'murmured against the good man of the house, saying, thou hast made these that have wrought but one hour, equal unto us who have borne the heat and burden of the day.'—Poor fellows, how sorely they were fatigued, with their great and severe labors! They bore the heat and burden of the day, labored hard, and were very much fatigued with doing good, and now to have, those lazy, indolent men that had been idle all day get as much as themselves; it was too hard. These were some of the hard laboring characters in olden times, but we have never learned that these complaints of hard fare and poor pay, gave them any exclusive title to the name of Christians.

'Come unto me ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy and my burden light.' So said the Savior, and it might be well for this tract writer to cast off that burden, that makes him complain so sorely of fatigue, and take upon himself the yoke of Christ. If he will cease from laboring for the adversary, and serve and obey the Lord Jesus, we will answer for it, he will find rest, and we shall hear no more complaints about fatigue.

Universalists do not complain of fatigue from great labor in doing good!! Right and we hope that they never will. We have found the yoke of Christ to be easy and his burden light, and have found rest unto our souls.—Why then should we complain of fatigue. 'We that have believed do enter into rest.' Why then we ask again should we complain of fatigue? Reader we caution you to beware of the 'heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne which they bind, and lay upon mens shoulders.' When you hear a man complaining of fatigue from his great labor in doing good, you may be sure that he has not done much good. The yoke of Christ is easy and his burden is light, and those who wear that yoke, and bear that burden, will always find rest instead of fatigue. The Lord make thee wise, that thou mayest refuse the evil and choose the good.

I. D. W.

SERVANTS AND SONS.—When the prodigal Son formed the resolution to return to his father's house, his highest hope was that he would be made a servant. He was 'no more worthy to be called a Son,' but would be glad to be made as one of the 'hired servants.' He had no idea that his father would make him a son, and hence would be content to be a servant. But the father joyfully received him as his son.

Now we have often thought that men in our day are much like the prodigal. The gospel would raise men to the dignity of sons, heirs of God and joint heirs with

Christ. 'Behold what manner of love the father hath bestowed on us that we should be called the sons of God.' But men like the prodigal cannot comprehend the wonders of that grace which would make them sons and daughters; and so they aspire only to 'hired servants' laboring for their pay. In this consists the true difference between the bondage of error and the liberty of Christ. The believer in human systems considers himself as a servant, who will be very sure to receive all he earns and no more. Whereas the disciple of Christ looks upon himself as a son and heir, who will receive a rich inheritance from the ample grace of a father. The consequence is, that one is a slave 'under the lash, and the other a willing and obedient child, for as a man thinketh so is he.'

I. D. W.

MR. COLES AND HIS QUESTIONS.—According to promise, we now attempt to answer the questions contained in the letter from Mr. G. Coles, inserted in our last week's paper. In the first place, the Rev. gentleman inquires 'how we reconcile the supposition, that we are right and all the rest of mankind wrong, in respect to the belief of endless punishment, with the justice and mercy of God, in keeping so great a part of mankind in ignorance and misery so long?' The question, we acknowledge to be profound, and weighty, and pointed; so much so that we are not able fully to understand its meaning. We have never assumed to be exclusively right, while 'all the rest of mankind are wrong.' Those who believe in endless misery, we regard as having embraced an error on that point. But whether Mr. Coles wishes us to reconcile our opinion, relative to the salvation of all men with the justice and mercy of God; or whether, admitting it true, he wishes to know how the justice and mercy of God can be reconciled with the fact, that men are kept so long in ignorance of this truth and are consequently miserable, we are not able to determine.

If the first proposition embraces the thing he wished to ascertain, we apprehend the question can be answered very easily to his satisfaction, unless he is unreasonable in his demands. It needs no argument to show the salvation of all men to be consistent with divine mercy. It is too apparent to be denied. All will admit that it would be a glorious display of divine mercy to save all mankind from sin and suffering of every kind. And as to the justice of God, most men will acknowledge—for the position cannot be controverted that justice requires universal obedience; and it demands also the infliction of punishment for disobedience—a punishment, the object of which is, to restrain from transgression and induce obedience. This is required by divine justice; for the 'law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul.' Hence eternal disobedience is incompatible with the justice of God. That can never be satisfied with the mere infliction of punishment, without accomplishing a higher object, that of bringing the sufferer to a willing obedience. Consequently universal obedience—which necessarily involves holiness and universal salvation—is perfectly consistent with the justice of God. Both justice and mercy are easily reconciled with the salvation of all mankind.

But if Mr. Coles means to inquire, how, on the supposition that Universalism is true, we can reconcile the present ignorance and misery of mankind, with the justice and mercy of God, we will endeavor, and may perhaps be able, to solve this question also. Or perhaps Mr. Coles means, if Universalism is true, how can God be just and merciful in not having it known at an earlier period of the world? We hope next time he writes he will express himself with less ambiguity. If the latter is the meaning of his question, the same may be asked in reference to Methodism, Calvinism, and Christianity itself. How can God be just and merciful in not sending his Son into the world at an earlier period—in keeping mankind in misery, and ignorance of Jesus Christ for so long a time? Allowing Methodism true, how is it that

popery prevailed for so long a time, and Methodism was known only to a very few until the days of John Wesley? And how can this be reconciled with divine justice and mercy? In answering these questions, he will answer the similar questions he has asked in reference to Universalism.

It is our opinion that ignorance and misery are suffered to prevail for the accomplishment of some great purpose which the Deity has in view. As the sons of Jacob were permitted to sell their brother into Egypt—as the perverse Jews were permitted to crucify the Lord of glory!—as 'blindness in part hath happened unto Israel until the fullness of the gentiles be come in', for the accomplishment of God's plans and purposes;—so we believe ignorance and misery are even now permitted to prevail in the world, for the attainment of some object equally wise and benevolent. That attained, the ignorance and misery, now in the world, will give place to the light and enjoyment of the gospel of Christ. This must be admitted, whether we are right, or Mr. Coles. If he can account for the permission of sin and misery on the supposition that endless misery is true, he will find no difficulty in accounting for them on any other supposition. Since they do exist, a wise Being will overrule them for good. 'The wrath of man shall praise him, the remainder of wrath will he restrain.' But it is the harder question, on the supposition that Mr. Coles is right, how can endless sin and suffering be reconciled with the justice and mercy of God? What good can ever arise from perpetuating sin and misery through eternity? It will require many new arguments, and the erection of still another new hell to solve these questions.

In the post script of Mr. Coles' letter, which is nearly as long as the letter itself, he asks, 'how comes it to pass that so few are delivered from the fear of endless punishment, on the supposition that there is no just ground for it?' It is very strange that men should be so near sighted as they sometimes are in religious matters. If Mr. Coles had but cast a single glance at his own letter, after writing it, he might have found an easy solution of this question, without applying to us. In the first inquiry, he acknowledges the ignorance of mankind. Now it is the easiest thing in the world for the ignorant to be deceived, and made to entertain fears without any just cause,—especially when such men as Mr. Coles are endeavoring by the propagation of endless misery, to perpetuate that ignorance and increase those fears. A child is very easily frightened with the parental assurance that 'the bears will catch it.' And children of a larger growth are frightened on the same principle, when assured that the devil will catch them. We might go back only a few years, and ask the same question in relation to witchcraft, and every visionary notion which has been entertained in ages past, and excited superstitious fears without any just cause. How comes it to pass that witchcraft prevailed, and so few were found bold enough to stand up in opposition to it, if there was no just ground for the fear of being bewitched? A thousand idle speculations might be as well supported, and made to appear as consistent, as endless misery, by asking just such questions as have been proposed by Mr. Coles. We deem his questions sufficiently answered, and we hope next time he makes inquiries, he will be more clear and more to the point. And further, we should like to know something more about his new hell.

'SINGULAR DISCOVERY.'—The following from the New York Courier, will show the very restraining influence of a belief in endless misery. Those who claim all the piety and all the religion in the world, might do well to clear their own skirts, before they charge all the iniquity upon Universalists. Let them read, and blush, and be wise, if they are not, by their creed, rendered incapable of attaining wisdom. Our readers may recollect a few days since we related the circumstances of an infant abandoned by

its mother, having been found in an open lot in Thirtieth street. In consequence of being betrayed by an acquaintance, the wretched woman was arrested on Tuesday last on a police warrant, and committed to Bridewell. We believe she did not deny the crime with which she was charged, but in extenuation of her conduct, stated that the father of the child having refused to contribute to its maintenance, she was unable to support it and accordingly resolved to abandon it to its fate. She lurked near the spot where the child was deposited and saw it taken up and conveyed to the Alms House. Thro' the persuasion of the magistrate, and in order to make some atonement to the public for the burthen which she had imposed on its charity, she yesterday made the necessary affidavit, upon which a bastardy warrant was issued against the father of the child, who proves to be a reverend clergyman of the Presbyterian denomination, but whose name we withhold, not from a desire to screen the offender from public reprobation, but from the respect we entertained of the pious sect of which he has long been a pastor. We saw the reverend sinner cowering and trembling beneath the weight of fear and shame, and entreated that he might be allowed to give security for the maintenance of the child and then be liberated. The magistrate at last assented to his entreaty; the bail was given and the reverend Mr. D——— was suffered to depart with his friend.

It is but justice to add that the woman admitted having received money to defray the expenses of her confinement from the defendant, but that he refused to contribute anything further. She is about 40 years old, and is of a respectable family. —N. Y. Courier.

DISCUSSION AT HUNTINGTON L. I.—Notice was given a few weeks since, of a discussion of Universalism to be holden at this place on the 25, 26 and 27th ult. It was to be an oral discussion, between Rev. Ira Ferris of the Methodist connexion; and Rev. S. C. Bulkeley, a Universalist. Accordingly, the parties met in the church belonging to the Methodist Episcopal society in that place at the time appointed. By the following letter from the New York Christian Messenger, we learn the result.

BR. PRICE—The Discussion between BRS. FERRIS and Bulkeley has just closed. It was holden in the Methodist Episcopal Church in this place, on the 25th, 26th, and 27th inst, according to the articles of agreement. Messrs. Cornelius Hansen and Amos Belden, of New York, and Abel K. Conklin, of Huntington, presided as Moderators. We are happy to be enabled to state that the debate commenced, continued, and concluded in the spirit of christian charity and brotherly love.—The church was well filled during the whole time, and especially on the last day it was crowded to overflowing. And it is due to the congregation to say, that the most devout attention was paid, and the utmost decorum prevailed throughout the debate. Much ability and controversial talent were manifested by both parties. Of the arguments urged by the respective parties during the discussion, it does not become us to speak. But this much we must be permitted to say, that Mr. Ferris has acted the part of a gentleman and christian, and we are constrained to believe, that he possesses a heart altogether too good for his creed. As to Mr. Bulkeley, it is sufficient to say, that he met the most sanguine expectation of his friends both in manner and in matter. There were fourteen clergymen present, viz. 4 Presbyterians, 2 Baptists, 4 Methodists, 1 Quaker, and 3 Universalists. It is our opinion that this debate will lead those who listened, to a closer investigation of the sacred scriptures, and be the means, under the blessing of God, of advancing the cause of truth. Yours, in the faith of the Gospel,

S. J. HILLYER.
L. C. MARVIN.

Huntington, L. I., Aug. 27, 1835.

Mr. Price of the Messenger says, 'Our friends appear to be abundantly satisfied with the labors of Br. Bulke-

ley; though we would by no means make invidious comparisons. The parties met in friendship—discussed their question in a friendly manner—parted friends. They were disposed to leave the verdict on their respective arguments, with those who heard them, to which we cheerfully respond, Amen! believing always, that an investigation conducted as this was, will result in good.

¶ We beg pardon of Br. Adams for our notice of his article relating to the state of man in the resurrection.—He wrote sinless, but the Compositor printed single, 'thats all.' We have hopes of him yet.

ASSOCIATIONS.—The Rockingham Association of Universalists convened at Deerfield, N. H. Aug. 25, 1835. And after the business of the council was done, it was voted to adjourn to meet at Epping, the last Wednesday and Thursday in Aug. 1836. Delegates were chosen to send to the New Hampshire Convention. No other business of importance was transacted, with the exception of passing one or two resolutions by way of puffing. The cause was represented as being in a very prosperous condition; and the brethren in council were very happy.

The Genesee Association met at Pavilion, town of Covington N. Y. Aug. 19th. Delegates from twelve societies were present. The society in Buffalo was received into fellowship; a letter of fellowship was granted to Br. T. P. Abell, as a minister of the gospel. The Constitution was so altered that the Association 'may be at liberty to unite with the New York State Conventions' but 'voted that we will not ask' its fellowship. The Association adjourned to meet at Buffalo the 3d Wednesday and Thursday of Aug. 1836.

¶ Ministers brethren who attend the U. S. Convention, when they arrive in the city will please call at the Connecticut Hotel, Maine st. where a committee will be in waiting to receive them.

Religious Notices.

¶ THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF UNIVERSALISTS IN THE UNITED STATES will meet in annual session at this place (Hartford) on the evening preceding the third [Wednesday 16th] of Sept. next. The council, according to the usual practice, will continue in session two days. We anticipate a pleasant and profitable session, and expect a full attendance of delegates and visiting brethren.

Br. O. A. Skinner of Baltimore, will preach in the Universalist Church in Hartford, next Sabbath.

On the 2 sabbath in Sept. there will be preaching, by Br. M. Ballou at Barkhamsted—by Br. Williams at Poquonock—and by Br. Shrigley at Millington—Br. Shrigley will also preach a lecture at Hamburg on Saturday evening previous, and at Colchester on Sunday evening at half past 7 o'clock.

Br. Bugbee of Guilford Vt. will preach at Granby on the 3d Sabbath in Sept.

There will be preaching on the 3d sabbath at Broadbrook.

There will be preaching at Hitchcocksville on the third Sabbath inst.

There will be preaching at Durham on Friday evening 25th inst, at Killingworth on Sunday the 27th, and at Upper Middletown on Monday 28th.

There will be preaching at Northfield on the third Sabbath inst.

The Connecticut State Convention of Universalists will hold its annual session, in Barkhamsted, Ct. on the 2d Wednesday and following Thursday [14th and 15th] of October next.

M. H. SMITH,
Standing Clerk.

POETRY.

WHERE IS PLEASURE?—Rev. 5: 53.

Canst thou tell me, fairest creature,
Fickle, vain, and full of pride;
Beautiful in every feature,
Yet unstable as the tide—

Canst thou tell me—say, fair maiden,
Where the streams of pleasure roll?
Where each breeze is freshly laden
With the joys that cheer the soul?

Is it on the troubled ocean?
Is it in the desert's gloom?
Is it in the world's commotion?
Or on victor's haughty plume?

Is it in the crowded mansions,
Where the great for pleasure meet?
Is it in the gayest fashions,
Which our *apish* people greet?

No, 'tis there that shades of sorrow
Blacken every scene of joy—
Every bright perspective morrow
Brings with it its own alloy—

Shades of woe are onward stealing,
Dark and drear, our bliss to mar;
Every joyful, happy feeling,
Has its peace-destroying jar.

Is it in the congregation,
Where the nations worship God?
Yea, 'tis here that consolation
Comes without the chastening rod.

Here the hopes of glory brighten—
Faith is ripe for clearer sky—
Here the Gospel beams enlighten
All that now in darkness lie.

Here is comfort—here is pleasure,
Here is peace for all mankind—
Here is meted without measure
Peace for every trouble mind.

Star & Uni.

Friendship.

'High and precarious are the ties that vice doth bind,
But virtue leaves a lasting friendship in the mind.'

Of all the passions that have at different times warmed the human breast, that of friendship is in itself one of the noblest, and originates in the most benevolent and disinterested of sentiments. By friendship is not to be understood that extensive signification, which indiscriminately includes all as friends with whom we are in the habit of intimacy, whether arising from connexion in life, or that attractive impulse which gives us more confidence in the society of some, whose ideas concur with our own in points which are not in themselves virtuous, or which we can freely communicate, than with others, where our inclination is overawed by superior virtue, and with whom we are restrained by the fear of lessening ourselves in their estimation. Although the acknowledgment of a man's possessing some particular vice could not give him friends, still there are not wanting those who would be disposed to judge more favorably of him on that account, from the consciousness of being under the influence of the same bad quality themselves; and who would lay hold of that circumstance to court his acquaintance, that they might have his example to screen them, and be under the less restraint in exercising their own

vicious propensity. Those of bad character will naturally flock together, that they may be the less check upon each other. But intimacy formed on such grounds will always be precarious and easily interrupted; for faith and honor can have little influence where vice is the only cement.

Nothing is consistent with, or in any manner related to friendship, but that which is itself strictly virtuous. A person who, under this title, inspires confidence in the breast of another towards himself, and encourages him to unbosom himself in particulars which are not virtuous, unless he is actuated by the motive of rendering him this important service—of representing to him in true colours, the pernicious and fatal tendency of suffering such ideas to have a place in his mind, is a secret and most dangerous enemy, who, in the first place, ensnares him by flattering his predominant passion, engages his other faculties by humoring this, lays reason and discretion dormant, and then pursues his advantage by rendering the influence he has obtained over his own soul, the instrument whereby he strengthens and confirms him in bad habits, and makes immoral thoughts familiar to his mind; thereby destroying the spring of that sensibility which alone can guard him from the encroachments of evil. Thus the name of friendship is only assumed as a disguise to cover vice, and its sacred purity violated for the worst of purpose.

In a virtuous mind, such actions of another as come within the circuit of his observation, and which are the result of sentiments conformable with his own, will strike an impression which, in the course of intimacy, will rise to esteem. On the basis of a mutual esteem of this kind, real friendship is founded. It is that benevolent sentiment which springs up in our breast by viewing good actions in others; it is that tribute of respect and admiration which carries its own proof, that we are actuated by the same generous motives, and it seldom fails of procuring us with others the same esteem and good will which we ourselves feel. The same virtue that we respect in others, will in ourselves be respected. Thus esteem unites us in the close bonds of friendship. It is this which raises the human character so high above the level of the inferior creation; it is the result of the proper exercise of those superior intellects with which man is endowed, which teaches him to discriminate between the different motives that produce other's actions, and upon this observation is grounded that sentiment, which is of such great importance to the law of life, and which adds such a value to its enjoyments.

And but for this principle of humanity, what were the satisfaction of life? Were the favors that we mutually bestow on each other to be proportioned out only according to the interest we have at stake, or the advantage accruing to ourselves from conferring them, what confidence could we have in each other? What certain rule could be drawn to guard us against treachery? But it is the sentiment of friendship which interests us for the welfare of others, when we ourselves have not the least expectation of advantage, which makes us as sincere in promoting the success of our friends as our own, and which gives us the inclination not only of watching for the personal safety, but of apprising him of his danger when he tends towards any particular vice; and on the recurrence of the desire in him, to give it salutary check, which each time

will lessen its impulse, and perhaps at last entirely extinguish it.

'A friend is our chief enjoyment in the days of prosperity, and in adversity our sweetest consolation.'

Saturday Evening Post.

A FRAGMENT.

It was night. A solemn stillness pervaded the place where, a little before, all was noise, and bustle, and anxiety. It was a time for *thought*—when the mind, unoccupied with other cares, could indulge in communings with itself, or contemplate the present or future condition of a slumbering world.

A slumbering world! Aye, truly so. In-sensible of their obligations—of duty—of the mind's eternal interests, the myriads of mankind sleep, sleep on—are unconscious of the importance of those truths which concern their peace, and consequently, inactive—or if otherwise, employed about things of little or no account. Perhaps the visions of the night are kindred to the idle dreams of the day—confused, unsubstantial, unreal. But a spirit moves upon the mass of mind; a voice breaks the dread silence, and whispers a word of consolation.

'Though unheeded by the now thoughtless multitude, the morning approaches. There shall be a resurrection of *mind*. The morally dead shall 'come forth'—this dormant state shall be succeeded by effort, and effort by success! Brooding night, with its narcotic influence, shall be banished by the light of truth, and man shall awake to behold and enjoy the beams of a happy day. It shall be so! There is a redeeming principle in human nature; that principle shall become active—in becoming active it shall become useful; and in its onward and upward progress, it shall find a home for the suffering children of a kind Father, in the embrace of infinite benevolence; and in the bare thought of the world's destiny, an incentive to the adoration of Heaven, and to works of unperceived kindness towards the ignorant and those who are out of the way.'—*Universalist*.

'Whoso dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God and God in him.'

Marriages.

In this city. [Hartford] by Rev. M. H. Smith, Mr. George Gay of Columbus, Ga. to Miss Phebe Johnson of Clinton, N. Y.

In this city, by the Rev. Dr. Davis, Mr. Alexander H. Reed to Miss Harriet G. Kelsey.

Deaths.

In this city, the 3d inst. Miss Mary Hempsted, aged 46 years.

In Somers, Mr. Horace K. Collins, aged 29.

In Waterford, Capt. Elisha Beckwith, aged 67.

In Simsbury, Capt. Wait Latimer, aged 66.

REMOVALS.

THE OFFICE of the Inquirer and Anchor in Hartford, is removed to the building formerly owned and occupied by Mr. N. Ruggles in Main St. a few rods south west of the State House square.

The office of the Inquirer and Anchor in Albany is removed to the room over E. Murdock's store, directly opposite the Eagle Tavern, South Market st.